Charging for Articulation

A study prepared for the British Columbia Council on Admissions and Transfer

March 2005

Dr. Ian Mugridge

555 SEYMOUR STREET
SUITE 709
VANCOUVER, BC
V6B 3H6
CANADA

TEL 604-412-7700
FAX 604-683-0576

EMAIL admin@bccat.bc.ca
WEB www.bccat.bc.ca

BRITISH COLUMBIA COUNCIL ON
ADMISSIONS & TRANSFER
SUPPORTING BC's EDUCATION SYSTEM

Charging for Articulation

Prepared by:

Dr. Ian Mugridge

© Copyright 2005 by the
British Columbia Council on Admissions and Transfer
709 – 555 Seymour Street, Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6B 3H6
Telephone: (604) 412-7700 Fax: (604) 683-0576

E-mail: admin@bccat.bc.ca

BCCAT is the official mark of the B.C. Council on Admissions and Transfer, as published by the Registrar of Trade-marks of the Canadian Intellectual Property Office.

This report is also available in Adobe Acrobat Portable Document Format (pdf), from BCCAT Online, the Internet service of the B.C. Council on Admissions and Transfer

www.bccat.bc.ca

Photocopying and further distribution of this document is permitted. Please credit source.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary **6**

1. Introduction 6
2. Methodology 7
4. Charging for articulation – the view of private institutions 9
6. Charges for articulation 11
7. Other issues 12
8. Recommendations 14

Appendix I: Individuals Consulted **17**

Executive Summary

In attempting to provide answers to the questions posed by the British Columbia Council on Admissions and Transfer, the consultant examined practices in other selected jurisdictions and discussed the questions with representatives of public and private institutions and agencies in the province. The review of practice in other jurisdictions showed that the BC transfer system is unique and that it is similar in major ways only to the system administered by the Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfer. That body operates under a mandate to ensure that the transfer of credit between and among both public and private institutions in the province is as open and seamless as possible and that all institutions are regarded as equal in terms of transferability once articulation agreements have been made.

Opinion in both the public and private institutions was divided on the basic question of charging for developing and maintaining articulation agreements though the great majority of public institutional representatives favoured imposing charges while a similar majority of private institutional representatives opposed it. The recommendations reflect the consultant's view that something akin to the Alberta system for including private and out of province institutions in the system would provide BC students, the presumed beneficiaries of the provincial transfer system, with a more flexible and responsive transfer system. Thus, while BCCAT may not prescribe a system of charging for articulation and decisions to charge or not to charge will remain an institutional prerogative; this report's principal recommendation is that public institutions and BCCAT not charge for articulation with private or out of province institutions.

1. Introduction

In September, 2004, following discussions both within and outside the council and an earlier two-phase study of the costs of articulation,[1] the British Columbia Council on Admissions and Transfer (BCCAT) commissioned a study to review the general question of charging private or out-of-province institutions for articulation of their courses and programs with provincial public institutions. This general question was broken down into six more specific questions as follows:-

a. Is it reasonable and/or advisable for BCCAT to charge private and out of province institutions for costs associated with their inclusion in the B.C. Transfer System?

b. Is it reasonable and/or advisable for B.C. public institutions to charge private and out of province institutions for costs associated with arranging and maintaining articulation agreements?

c. What charges might BCCAT consider levying?

d. What charges might public institutions consider levying?

e. Should BCCAT develop guidelines for institutional charges?

f. What principles, what best practices, and what pros and cons must be considered in any decision on charging?

In a subsequent discussion, the council requested the addition of a seventh question as follows: –

g. Should any proposed policy distinguish between for-profit and not-for-profit institutions, and, if so, how should that be done?

---

[1] J. Jarvis & Associates, *Articulation Costing*, 2004.

2. Methodology

Three different strands of investigation were pursued in the course of developing this study. First, an attempt was made to review practices in other jurisdictions related to the question of charging for articulation – specifically, enquiries were made of representatives of two Canadian provinces, Alberta and Ontario, of one American state, Washington, and two Commonwealth nations, the United Kingdom and Australia. Second, the questions posed were reviewed with representatives of many public, post-secondary institutions in the province as well as in a meeting with the council's Transfer and Articulation Committee. In addition, they were discussed with representatives of provincial public education bodies in BC such as the Private Post-secondary Education Commission (PPSEC), now re-named and re-mandated as the Private Career Training Agency of BC (PCTIA), and the Degree Quality Assessment Board (DQAB). Third, the same questions were reviewed with representatives of some of the private institutions that are already members of the provincial transfer credit system. In addition, discussions were held with three private institutions which may in future wish to articulate some of their courses with public institutions. Summaries of responses to the questions posed will be dealt with in three separate sections, corresponding to these lines of inquiry, in the report that follows.

Initially, it had been anticipated that it would be necessary to conduct face-to-face discussions with all or most of the individuals involved; but the number and quality of responses to initial e-mail approaches were such that, except in cases where particular individuals requested a meeting, this proved to be unnecessary. I should include at this point a word of thanks to the individuals who responded so thoughtfully and fully to my questions. Their replies have done much to formulate the views expressed in this report and the recommendations that have been made. A list of respondents and discussants is attached to this report as Appendix I.

3. Charging for articulation in other jurisdictions

Enquiries of representatives of three jurisdictions outside Canada – Washington State, Australia and England[2], - revealed, predictably, that nothing comparable to the BC structure exists in their areas and that transfer credit has not yet become the major issue that it has in this province. The most relevant practices seem to be those in Australia. Within individual Australian states, there exist tertiary admissions committees (TAC) that filter university admissions applications.

This rather informal system is, however, becoming more formal as the number of students applying for admission with partial tertiary qualifications grows rapidly. The Queensland TAC apparently feels that it has become so expert at dealing with such applications that it is offering an assessment and validation service to the other states. Further, individual institutions may make articulation and transfer agreements with overseas institutions in which financial arrangements are a matter solely for the institutions concerned. It is worth noting that the director of the Australian University Quality Agency ended his discussion with what he described as "an intelligent though non-informed comment" that "one should decide who pays and who benefits," so that, if inclusion benefits an institution, it should pay whereas, if the students benefit, perhaps the government should cover the cost.

---

[2] Note that the agency consulted in the United Kingdom was the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education through its director, Peter Williams, which is an organization whose jurisdiction is confined to England rather than the entire UK.

No comparable structures exist in the English or Washington State post-secondary systems. Similar comments apply to the province of Ontario where no systematic attempt to manage or regulate transfer credit between colleges and universities and where, with the mandates of colleges and universities being quite different, there hitherto has been little need or demand for transfer credit. However, with the recent government authorization of colleges of applied arts and technology (CAAT) to offer applied degrees and with the growing entry of private and external institutions into the provincial degree-granting field, this situation is likely to change. For example, the provincial Post-secondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB) has recently dealt with its first case of approving a degree based on a 2+2 arrangement between a college and a university.

The province of Alberta is the jurisdiction where practices in the area of admissions and transfer are closest to those in BC and an extended discussion of the Alberta system will thus be useful. The mandate of the Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfer (ACAT) clearly recognizes that both public and private institutions in the province are part of the same system: the first principle of ACAT is that student access to higher education and opportunities for mobility among institutions shall be optimized and representatives of both public and private sectors are appointed as council members[3].

At this point, eleven private institutions are authorized to offer degrees and diplomas in the province and are recognized as part of the ACAT system. The seven institutions authorized to offer degrees have been accredited by the Private Colleges Review Board or its successor, the Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC) which, like BC's DQAB, will review all future degree proposals from both public and private institutions. It is worth noting here, in the context of the additional question posed for this study that one for-profit institution, DeVry-Calgary, is authorized to offer degrees in the province and has been treated in the same way as other private institutions.

Accreditation of private institutions' programs by CAQC, however, does not imply admission to the ACAT system. To be admitted to the system as a sending institution, a private college or university must work out a transfer agreement with a public institution that will then, if it wishes to do so, recommend that the results of the agreement be included in the provincial transfer guide. Costs of negotiating such agreements are borne by the institutions involved. Once the agreement is published, the sending institution has access at no cost to the public system. It should further be noted that this does not imply articulation with other public institutions and that private institutions must articulate separately with every receiving institution.

It is a basic principle of the Alberta system that all public institutions as well as those accepted by the CQAC are part of a single system, that all are placed on an equal footing and that the primary objective of the system is to ensure that Alberta students are served in the most effective and seamless way possible. It is worth noting here that this principle seems not yet to have been adopted by BCCAT in its latest statement on articulation for private and out of province institutions document.[4]

---

[3] *Council Principles, Policies and Procedures*, ACAT website

[4] See *Policy and Processes under which a Private Degree-Granting Institution Articulates Approved Degree Programs within the B.C. Transfer System*. This document was approved by BCCAT in October, 2004.

4. Charging for articulation – the view of private institutions

Perhaps the only surprising feature of the view of private institutions, both those that are already part of the provincial transfer system and those that may wish to consider seeking to become part of it, was that it was not unanimous. One institutional head argued that private institutions are in a position to charge students for articulation of courses to public institutions and that they should do so. Thus, any fees charged for articulation should be assessed and paid at the institutional level.

The other institutions were unanimous in arguing that private institutions should not be charged for the cost of articulation and transfer credit. Four institutions, Columbia, Coquitlam and Corpus Christi Colleges and Trinity Western University, are already part of the system on the basis of agreements with public institutions and their transferable offerings are listed in BCCAT's *British Columbia Transfer Guide*. These institutions are and will probably remain the largest private sources of students entering the public system with some post-secondary credit while the institutions which may seek to enter the system are small and likely to remain so.

Further, the nature of these institutions make it unlikely that they will wish to articulate their entire programs with public institutions and some are working with individual institutions with relevant programs to articulate appropriate parts of their own programs. They argue, as do the private colleges already in the system, that they are performing a service to BC students by providing them with an alternative means of entry to the public system and that they should not be penalized simply because they are private institutions. Nor, of course, should their students. In some cases where an institution recruits heavily from outside this country, they also maintain that they are bearing the cost of this recruiting instead of the public institutions to which their overseas students will probably transfer. Their argument is essentially that articulation and transfer is a benefit to those students who wish to take advantage of it, that it will assist such students in that they will be provided with additional entry points to the provincial system and not required to repeat their learning. Thus, they see articulation and transfer as a means of providing students with a more flexible and open system in which to achieve their educational goals.

5. Charging for articulation – the view of public institutions

Responses to the questions posed by BCCAT were received from thirteen public post-secondary institutions in the province as well as the director of the PPSEC, now registrar of PCTIA, and the chair and vice-chair of DQAB. As noted earlier, most of the individuals to whom I addressed the questions provided full and thoughtful responses to my e-mailed questions so that further interviews or follow-up were usually unnecessary. In some cases, however, individuals requested a discussion of the issues; and these discussions were supplemented with a lengthy discussion in the TAC.

It is worth remarking at the outset that all respondents emphasized the effectiveness of the BCCAT-administered system, based, as it is, on a high level of trust and respect both among the institutions involved and of the council itself. They thus clearly regard the transfer system as of major benefit to the provincial post-secondary system and wish to see it continue and, where appropriate and useful, to expand. There was less agreement on whether such expansion should involve the inclusion of more – potentially many more - private and out-of-province institutions in the system.

- It would not be over-stating the views of several respondents to say that there was evidence of some suspicion of, even hostility to increased participation of private and out-of-province institutions in post-secondary education in BC. This was partly responsible for an almost unanimous view that some kind of charges should be initiated in dealing with requests for articulation and transfer credit from such institutions. A fear that institutional resources would be inadequate to deal with increasing numbers of such requests did, however, play a large part.

- There were, however, exceptions to this view: two institutional representatives argued that such requests should not be subject to charges for review of programs and membership in the BCCAT system, a view that was endorsed by some members of the TAC. The argument was advanced that there should not be a two-tiered system of articulation and transfer, that either everybody or nobody should pay. Some TAC members nevertheless thought that a major influx into the system of new institutions requesting articulation might, at some point, paralyze it and that imposition of charges might be an effective way of discouraging some of these requests and of providing at least some of the extra resources needed to pay for increased activity.

- In the course of this discussion, other issues were raised that are relevant to the issues under review. The first was the policy question of what the government, the council and the institutions are trying to achieve in establishing and maintaining the transfer system, an issue that will be dealt with later in this paper. The second was that of the predicted scale of requests for articulation and transfer from institutions not now part of the provincial system.

- This latter point deserves to be partly dealt with here. Receiving institutions, particularly, of course, the universities, currently deal, as they have for many years, with individual requests for transfer credit which come not from institutions but from students (Note, however, that the universities do not consider requests from private colleges in BC that are not already part of the transfer system). Such requests are dealt with on a case by case basis and students are granted transfer credit according to the courses they have taken, of their transferability to the receiving institution and of their applicability to the program the students wish to enter. Where such credit is granted, it is clear that this occurs on the basis of the individual case under consideration and that the award of transfer credit in one case does not imply a general agreement to grant transfer credit to all courses provided by a sending institution or even to the same courses in a different situation. Thus, the question of the need for full articulation agreements between public and private institutions – except in the case of those that already exist in the province – is and is likely to remain moot. This issue will be further discussed later in this report.

- Notions of appropriate charges varied from full cost-recovery both for receiving institutions and for BCCAT for entry into and maintenance of the BC system to minimal charges for articulation only. No respondent argued that fees should be high enough to frighten away legitimate applicants whom its members might be willing to receive into the system. On the other hand, some respondents expressed the view that the negotiation of articulation agreements might simply be used by private or out-of-province institutions as a public relations tool and that this might be discouraged by charging high fees. Respondents from public institutions frequently expressed the view that their institutions would not have the resources to deal with developing articulation agreements. In other words, there was no agreement on the level of charges, the method of applying them or the purposes to be served by charging.

- A related issue was raised by some respondents, that of the charges imposed by DQAB for program review. While, as noted above, some respondents argued that there should be no charge for articulation, there was general agreement that the entry of DQAB into the system, by setting up a situation in which institutions must pay the costs of DQAB reviews, had at least made the principle of charging for such activities acceptable. There was also agreement, however, that recognition by DQAB and thus authorization to offer degrees in the province is quite different from the articulation of those degrees with existing institutions, a view that mirrors the situation in Alberta. The experience of institutions accredited by PPSEC/PCTIA bears this out. The two processes are seen as quite separate and will need to remain so. Some respondents argued, however, that recognition by DQAB might be meaningless without detailed articulation with other institutions in the province; and this notion seems at least partly responsible for the fear of a flood of applications for articulation agreements.

6. Charges for articulation

Having summarized the discussions about charging for articulation, it seems appropriate at this point to try to address the third and fourth questions being asked, what charges might public institutions and/or BCCAT consider levying for articulation between public and private institutions. The phase two study of articulation costs, referred to earlier, identifies the costs associated with this articulation for both sending and receiving institutions. This document calculates the apparently considerable costs to institutional administrations and faculties of negotiating and maintaining articulation agreements and to BCCAT of including new sending institutions as part of the provincial transfer credit system. If these calculations are realistic and if, as some have argued, there is a rush of requests for articulation agreements, it is clear that considerable extra resources will be required on the part of both types of institution and of the council.

A brief note on the costs of articulation seems appropriate at this point. The Jarvis report identified both system-wide costs (i.e. those related to BCCAT) and institutional costs of articulation. In attempting to arrive at realistic estimates for the costs associated with articulation of individual courses, the authors considered both administrative and faculty costs so that costs incurred by registrars' and deans' offices were calculated as well those incurred by faculty in reviewing course outlines and materials to establish equivalency. Their conclusion was that the average cost of articulation of individual courses was approximately $400.00 divided equally between the sending and receiving institution. If this estimate is accurate, therefore, a charge by receiving institutions would normally be in the neighbourhood of $200.00 per course unless specific circumstances indicated a higher or lower charge. Similarly, the Jarvis report, in dealing with maintenance of articulation agreements, assumed an annual maintenance cost of approximately $120 to receiving institutions which could be added to any charges for developing the agreement.[5]

Since, with few exceptions, representatives of public institutions argued that some charges were appropriate for articulation of private institutions' programs, it is necessary to try to determine what they should be. It should be noted that, having argued for charges, no individual was prepared to be specific about their nature or level. There seem, however, to be several options though detailed figures can only be attached to them as articulation agreements become a reality. These options are as follows:

---

[5] J. Jarvis & Associates, *Articulation Costing*, 2004, pp. 12-15.

1. Institutions charge the sending institution for the full cost of program review and of the administrative costs associated with implementing and maintaining the agreement. This would enable public institutions to reach agreements at no cost to themselves but would severely penalize private institutions which would be obliged to bear the cost of both sending and receiving courses.

2. Institutions charge the sending institution the cost of a defined portion of the cost of articulation agreements, either the cost of faculty review or the administrative costs associated with the agreement. This would allow receiving institutions to recover a defined part of their costs and would lighten the burden on the sending institutions.

3. Institutions charge a fixed fee for developing and maintaining articulation agreements in two stages – first, a fee for developing the agreement and, second, a continuing fee for maintaining it.

4. Institutions charge a single, fixed fee approximating to an agreed proportion of the cost of the agreement.

5. A fifth option – that any receiving institution has the option of waiving fees for articulation should this be seen as a benefit to the institution concerned – should also be included.

Similarly, BCCAT might consider charging private institutions for articulation agreements based on each of the options listed above and on their own calculations of the costs involved in administering that part of the BC transfer system.

The final option, supported by almost all private institutions and by a small minority of the public institutions, is that private institutions should be permitted to enter into articulation agreements with public institutions at no cost other than that incurred by negotiation and maintenance of the agreement (as well as other agreements developed subsequently) and to become part of the BC transfer system at no cost other than that associated with participating in such activities as articulation committees.

If a particular method of charging is decided on, it would seem reasonable for the resulting charges to be as uniform as possible so that, as an agency standing outside the institutions involved, it would probably be advisable for BCCAT to develop guidelines for institutional charges.

7. Other issues

1. For-profit and not-for-profit institutions

The final question asked by council relates to the need for and the possibility of making a distinction in any system of charges between for-profit and not-for-profit institutions. The following definitions have been obtained from the *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System* and seem to provide a reasonable way of distinguishing between the two types of institution. A private for-profit institution is defined as one "in which the individual(s) or agency in control receives compensation other than wages, rent, or other expenses for the assumption of risk." A private not-for-profit institution is defined as one "in which the individual(s) or agency in control receives no compensation, other than wages, rent, or other expenses for

the assumption of risk. These include both independent not-for-profit schools and those affiliated with a religious organization."

While these definitions may be a reasonable way of distinguishing between the two types of institution, they say nothing about the way in which they regard their academic missions or in which they conduct their relations with other institutions, either private or public; and it is more than likely that their motives for seeking articulation agreements with public institutions will be the same for both types of organization. There was, as noted earlier, a legitimate question about for-profit institutions that might see articulation with the public institutions as a public relations tool rather than as a means of securing expanded transfer credit opportunities for their students, in which case such institutions might be held to be in conflict if the interests of shareholders predominated over those of their students.

The representatives of private institutions with whom this issue was raised, however, saw no effective distinction between the two types of institution from the perspective of articulation agreements and felt that they should be treated in the same way for these purposes. It has already been noted that ACAT has treated DeVry-Calgary in the same way as private not-for-profit institutions. It is also worth noting that the Ontario PEQAB has made no distinction between the two types of institution in dealing with requests from private institutions inside and outside the province for degree- and/or diploma-granting powers and that one of the institutions involved is the Ontario branch of DeVry College.

2. *What is the object of the transfer system?*

Earlier in this study, it was noted that an overseas respondent had asked a question that should perhaps have prefaced the exercise as a whole, the very simple one of *cui bono?* Who will benefit from the articulation of courses and programs? A number of respondents raised this question in the course of discussions and the answer from all of them was virtually the same: that is, that BC students are or ought to be the primary beneficiaries of a system of transfer credit, such a system being designed and maintained to provide them with a variety of clearly defined paths to the degrees and diplomas they require. This came through most clearly in the discussion with the TAC. Some members spoke strongly against anything that might resemble a two-tier transfer system that seemed to discriminate against private institutions merely because they were private and against their students for the same reason. The analogy of a publicly developed and maintained road system available for the benefit of all who need it received some discussion and seemed to some members to be an apt one. The statements already cited from the principles of ACAT are relevant here as is the mission statement of ACAT: the council is charged with being "a catalyst for change and an advocate for learners in the areas of post-secondary admission and transfer. To carry out its mission Council provides leadership and direction in the improvement of educational opportunities for Alberta students through inter-institutional transfer."[6]

The analogy between the situations of the BC and Alberta councils is not precise since BCCAT is and has always been regarded as much more of an arm's length (from government) agency than has ACAT, a difference implied in the use of the word, direction, in the last sentence above. But the intention as well as the principle that the transfer system should work for the benefit of the students in post-secondary institutions, both public and private, is clear in Alberta in a way that is not the case in BC.

---

[6] Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfer, *Council Principles, Policies and Procedures*, nd., p. 1.

8. Recommendations

The following recommendations proceed from the discussion above.

Recommendation 1

That BCCAT and the BC public institutions should accept the principle that the purpose of the transfer system is to provide the province's students with open and flexible means of acquiring the credentials they need and that both public and private institutions have a part to play in providing these means.

> Though this general recommendation might be seen as outside the remit for this consultancy, it reflects much of the discussion that has ensued in preparing this report, it represents an attempt to implement an answer to questions about the purpose of the consultancy and of the transfer system as a whole. The answer to such questions is clearly relevant to answers to the specific questions posed.

Question 1

Is it reasonable and/or advisable for BCCAT to charge private and out of province institutions for costs associated with their inclusion in the BC transfer system?

Recommendation 2

That BCCAT should not charge private or out of province institutions for costs associated with their inclusion in the BC transfer system once agreements have been reached with the appropriate public institutions.

> This recommendation reinforces the principle implied in the first recommendation that the transfer system should be seen as pr[illegible]ling a publicly funded service for BC students whether from public or private institutions. It does, however, assume that judgment of the merits of requests for transfer credit rests with the receiving institutions rather than BCCAT.

Question 2

Is it reasonable and/or advisable for BC public institutions to charge private and out of province institutions for costs associated with arranging and maintaining articulation agreements?

Recommendation 3

That BC Public institutions should not charge private or out of province institutions for costs associated with arranging and maintaining articulation agreements but that the option for such charges should remain and that the question of charging for articulation should be left to the institutions involved.

> Implied in the preceding discussions and recommendations is the view that it should be a general principle that articulation of courses and programs should proceed freely and without charge. In practical terms, however, given the preponderant view from the public institutions that some charges ought to be made, there would be little point in recommending this without the qualification noted above. This recommendation also assumes that those private institutions currently included in the transfer system would continue to be so included under the terms that currently govern their membership.

Question 3

What charges might BCCAT consider levying?

Recommendation 4

That BCCAT should not charge private or out of province institutions for costs associated with their inclusion in the BC transfer system. This recommendation simply extends the principle enunciated in recommendation 2.

Question 4

What charges might public institutions consider levying?

Recommendation 5

a. That public institutions should have the option of charging private or out of province institutions for costs associated with the articulation of courses and programs and with maintenance of arrangements resulting from this activity.

b. That such charges should normally conform to guidelines developed by BCCAT

This recommendation simply extends the principle enunciated in recommendation 3. The assumption of the second part of this recommendation is that there ought to be some consistency among public institutions charging for articulation and that such charges should be seen only as a means of recovering real costs associated with articulation and maintenance of agreements where this is appropriate.

Question 5

Should BCCAT develop guidelines for institutional charges?

Recommendation 6:

That BCCAT should develop guidelines for institutions wishing to charge for articulation.

Such guidelines would be helpful to both the sending and receiving institutions involved and would help to provide some consistency and predictability across the system. At this point, it is likely that the Jarvis report would provide at least a starting point for the development of such guidelines.

Question 6

What principles, best practices, and what pros and cons must be considered in any decision on charging?

Recommendation 7

That, while practical considerations such as the availability of resources must impinge on decisions on charging, the primary consideration should be that of equitable treatment of the province's students and of the institutions that educate them.

This recommendation builds upon earlier comments and recommendations and implies that the primary beneficiaries of the transfer system are the province's students whose access to

and progress through the post-secondary system should be facilitated by the operation of the transfer system. This assumption implies too that institutions new to the system, once having been judged to be teaching credit-worthy courses and/or programs, should also be treated as equals.

Question 7

Should any proposed policy distinguish between for-profit and not-for-profit institutions and, if so, how should that be done?

Recommendation 8

That no attempt should be made to distinguish between these two kinds of institution.

The definitions cited above, which seem to provide a clearer distinction between the two kinds of institution than others, make no reference to the academic missions of such institutions which should be the most important consideration in beginning discussions about course transferability. If this is indeed the case, no distinction between for-profit and not-for-profit institutions is relevant in this situation. This would also bring BC practice into line with that of ACAT in Alberta and PEQAB in Ontario.

Appendix I: Individuals Consulted

The following individuals responded to a request for assistance with this study or provided input themselves. Enquiries of a number of other individuals and institutions, both public and private, in the province produced no response.

Name	Title
Blackman, Roger	Simon Fraser University, Vice-chair, Degree Quality Assessment Board
Budnikas, Marjorie	Director of Admissions, Corpus Christi College
Burke, Ron	Principal, Omni College
Cooke, Bill	Registrar, University College of the Fraser Valley
Cooke, Jim	Dean, Student and Instructional Services, Capilano College; BCCAT member
Elmes, Roger	Dean of Arts, Kwantlen University College
Genoe, Murray	Executive Director, College-University Consortium Council, Ontario
Gerson, Martin	Dean of Instruction, Langara College
Gibson, Bill	Vice President, Academic, Capilano College
Giguere, Louis	Interim Provost, BC Open University
Gillespie, Brian	Chair, Degree Quality Assessment Board
Gordon, Jody	Registrar, Kwantlen University College
Heath, Nick	Director of Admissions, Simon Fraser University
Lindsay, Jan	Vice President, Education, Kwantlen University College
Lust, Monica	Executive Director, BC Career Colleges Association
McGillivray, Judith	Vice President, Learning, Kwantlen University College
Morse, Ted	Director, College of Optics
Patton, Marilyn	Executive Director, Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfer
Peters, Julia	Director of Education, Vancouver Premier College of Hotel Management
Petter, Martin	Vice President, Education, North Island College
Seppanen, Loretta	Assistant Director, Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Sylvester, David	President, Corpus Christi College
Toone, Trevor	President, Columbia College
Williams, Peter	Executive Director, Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, England
Woodhouse, David	Executive Director, Australian University Quality Agency
Wright, Jim	Registrar, Private Career Training Institutions Agency of BC

In addition, a meeting was held with the Transfer and Articulation Committee of the BC Council on Admissions and Transfer which suggested several fruitful ideas. The committee also provided feedback on the first draft of this report. Frank Gelin, Executive Director, BCCAT and Finola Finlay, Associate Director provided information and comments from time to time.